DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 046 285 FL 002 068

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Hulet, Claude L.; And Others |
| TITLE | Teacher Training Practices in Foreign Language Instruction. |
| INSTITUTION | California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. |
| PUB DATE | 70 |
| NOTE | 34p. |
| EDRS PRICE | EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29 |
| DESCRIPTORS | Colleges, Inservice Teacher Education, Instructional Program Divisions, *Language Instruction, *Language Teachers, Modern Languages, Preservice Education, Secondary School Teachers, Second Language Learning, *State Surveys, *Teacher Attitudes, *Teacher Education, Teaching Methods, Universities |

ABSTRACT

This survey of teacher training programs and teacher attitudes, made in the fall of 1969, considers two broad areas of interest. One part was prepared to obtain information regarding foreign language teacher training programs and practices at colleges and universities in California. An opinionnaire, completed by 934 California language teachers, deals with professional courses and inservice work that the teachers had taken and their attitudes toward that training. Appendixes contain information on: (1) the survey, (2) participating schools, (3) questionnaire on the preparation of foreign language teachers, and (4) biographical data. Tables on courses, programs, methods, course evaluation, and inservice programs are included. (RL)

ED 046 285

# Teacher Training Practices in Foreign Language Instruction

Prepared by the

Liaison Committee on Foreign Language
of the
California Articulation Conference

FL 002 068

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

This publication, which was funded under provisions of the National Defense Education Act, Title III, was edited and prepared for photo-offset production by the Bureau of Publications, California State Department of Education, and published by the Department, 721 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, California 95814.

Printed by the Office of State Printing
1970

# FOREWORD

Over the past 25 years, foreign language teachers have been particularly alert to the potential that innovations in theories of cognition, technological advances, and international affairs can play in the effectiveness of teaching. Two significant publications that deal with new developments in foreign language instruction are *Language Instruction: Perspective and Prospectus* (1963), through which the State Department of Education made suggestions to update aims, objectives, and procedures; and *Foreign Language Articulation in California Schools and Colleges* (1966), in which the Liaison Committee on Foreign Language isolated and analyzed problems and made recommendations to improve articulation among all segments of public education in California, from kindergarten to graduate school. These publications were well received not only throughout this state, but nationally as well. They have proved helpful to many school districts in their attempts to articulate their foreign language programs.

I am pleased to note that the Liaison Committee on Foreign Language has once again taken on an important task – the consideration of teacher training practices in foreign languages. This report should receive the attention of all educational institutions involved in the training of foreign language teachers, offices of county superintendents of schools, school districts, and the State Department of Education. The various foreign language associations throughout the state should make a careful study of this report so that they may make constructive suggestions for its implementation.

It is encouraging to see that common goals are now being sought by various statewide groups concerned with foreign language instruction, including the Liaison Committee on Foreign Language, the California Foreign Language Teachers Association and its constituent organizations, and the State Department of Education. Only through our cooperative efforts toward the attainment of appropriate common goals can we develop and maintain an effective foreign language program in California public schools.

Max Rafferty

*Superintendent of Public Instruction*

# PREFACE

The California Articulation Conference is an agency now composed of volunteers who represent all segments of public education in California and the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities. This agency, which was established more than 45 years ago, has been meeting at least once a year to explore problems of common interest and to adopt resolutions and recommendations on specific issues of articulation.

In the spring of 1963, the Articulation Conference established the Liaison Committee on Foreign Language, charging it with the responsibility of recommending solutions to a number of articulation problems in foreign language education. The Committee consists of 26 persons – six each from the University of California, the California state colleges, the community colleges, and the high schools; one from the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, State Department of Education; and one from the Office of the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges.

In June, 1966, the first document prepared by the Liaison Committee on Foreign Language, *Foreign Language Articulation in California Schools and Colleges*, was published by the California State Department of Education. This brochure contains recommendations on general policy and procedures of instruction in foreign languages. Thousands of copies were distributed in California, and there were numerous requests for copies from other states.

Encouraged by this response, the Liaison Committee on Foreign Language undertook the investigation of the training of teachers of foreign languages in California's colleges and universities. This publication is a report of that investigation. It presents the results of (1) a survey of the provisions of teacher training programs in the colleges and universities; and (2) an opinionnaire completed by 934 teachers of foreign languages in California. It is the hope of the Liaison Committee on Foreign Language that teacher training institutions will assess their programs in the light of these findings.

The draft of this second publication prepared by the Liaison Committee was presented to its parent body, the Administrative Committee of the Articulation Conference, on May 12, 1970. The Administrative Committee approved of plans to publish and disseminate the report in California, and, upon request, in other states as well.

The Committee extends its thanks to Max Rafferty, Superintendent of Public Instruction, and his staff, particularly Robert S. Shute, Acting Chief, Bureau of National Defense Education Act Administration, and Mitchell Voydat, Chief, Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education.

The Committee is also indebted to several former members who contributed to the design of the survey and to Mrs. Mary DuFort, Coordinator, Arts and Humanities, Office of the Alameda County Superintendent of Schools, for her help in compiling the results of the survey.

The Committee wishes to express its appreciation to the many individuals who replied to the survey questionnaires, including classroom teachers, coordinators and supervisors of programs in offices of county superintendents of schools and school districts, and heads of departments of colleges and universities.

The Committee is especially grateful to Thomas L. Broadbent, Professor of German, University of California at Riverside, for the patient determination and organizational skill with which he guided the Subcommittee on Teacher Training to the successful completion of this study.

J. WILLIAM MAY
*Acting Chief, Division of Instruction*

MITCHELL VOYDAT
*Chief, Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education*

# THE LIAISON COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE

The Liaison Committee on Foreign Language is a statewide committee representing all segments of public education in California, from elementary school through graduate school. The Committee was established in 1963 by the California Articulation Conference.

**Officers, 1969-70**

*Chairman:* Claude L. Hulet, Associate Professor of Spanish, University of California, Los Angeles

*Secretary:* Harold Wingard, Specialist, Foreign Language, San Diego Unified School District

**Officers, 1968-69**

*Chairman:* Ruth P. Craig, Chairman, Department of Foreign Languages, Santa Rosa Junior College

*Secretary:* Arthur L. Askins, Assistant Professor of Spanish, University of California, Berkeley

**Officers, 1967-68**

*Chairman:* G. Gilbert Rogers, Secondary Curriculum Consultant, Office of the San Luis Obispo County Superintendent of Schools

*Secretary:* Robert E. Pyle, Head, Department of Foreign Languages, Chico State College

**Officers, 1966-67**

*Chairman:* Edmond E. Masson, Associate Professor of French and Russian, University of California, Santa Barbara

*Secretary:* G. Gilbert Rogers, Secondary Curriculum Consultant, Office of the San Luis Obispo County Superintendent of Schools

# CONTENTS


*Page*

Foreword ..... iii
Preface ..... v
The Liaison Committee on Foreign Language ..... vii

**The Scope of the Survey** ..... 1

**Teacher Training in Foreign Languages** ..... 2
Admission Requirements ..... 2
Programs for Prospective Teachers ..... 3
Methods Course ..... 3
Supervision ..... 5
Granting of Teaching Credential ..... 6
Foreign Languages in the Elementary School (FLES) ..... 6

**The Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers** ..... 8

**Summary** ..... 14

**Appendixes**

A. A Survey of Teacher Training in Foreign Languages ..... 15
B. Universities, State Colleges, and Private Schools from Which Responses to Form A Were Received ..... 19
C. Questionnaire on the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers ..... 21
D. Location by County of Respondents to Survey Form B ..... 24
E. Members of the Liaison Committee on Foreign Language, 1969-70 ..... 25
F. Former Members of the Liaison Committee ..... 27

**Tables**

1. Required and Recommended Courses in Programs for Prospective Teachers ..... 3
2. Major Concern of the Methods Course in Teacher Training Programs ..... 4
3. Ratings of Courses and Activities Taken by Credential Holders ..... 10
4. Inservice Programs Desired by Teachers ..... 12

# The Scope of the Survey

One way to improve foreign language instruction in the classroom is to improve the caliber of foreign language teaching. The question is "How?"

One analysis of that formidable "How?" was made by the Liaison Committee on Foreign Language of the California Articulation Conference through preparation of a two-part survey in the fall of 1969. One part, entitled "A Survey on Teacher Training in Foreign Languages" (Form A), was prepared to obtain information regarding foreign language teacher training programs and practices at colleges and universities in California. (See Appendix A.) Results of national surveys that have ascertained the nature of training programs for foreign language teachers are available in professional literature.[1] Literature is also available concerning training for teachers of foreign languages that is recommended by experts in the field as appropriate and even ideal.[2] The survey at hand, however, is concerned strictly with foreign language teacher training practices in California.

The other part of the survey, entitled "Questionnaire on the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers" (Form B), deals with the professional courses and inservice work that the foreign language teachers surveyed had taken and their attitudes toward that training. (See Appendix C.) The content of both survey forms was prepared by the members of the Liaison Committee, but the preparation and distribution of the forms was a joint effort of the Committee and the State Department of Education.

---

[1] "The Preparation of College Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages." A conference report prepared and edited by Archibald T. MacAllister. *PMLA*, LXXIX (May, 1964), 29.

[2] Nelson Brooks, "The Ideal Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers," *Modern Language Journal*, L (February, 1966), 71.

Bela H. Banathy, "The Design of Foreign Language Teacher Education," *Modern Language Journal*, LII (December, 1968), 490.

"Standards for Teacher-Education Programs in Modern Foreign Languages," prepared by a conference convened by the Modern Language Association in December, 1963. *PMLA*, LXXIX (September, 1964 – Part 2), A-12.

# Teacher Training in Foreign Languages

Survey Form A was distributed to the foreign or modern language and education departments at campuses of the University of California, state colleges, and private colleges and universities in California. (See Appendix A.) Responses were received from 52 persons at 26 different institutions. (See Appendix B.)

Survey Form A is composed of six major sections designed to determine prevalent practices in the following aspects of foreign language teacher training programs:

1. Requirements for admission to the credential program
2. Nature of the program for prospective teachers
3. General information regarding the methods courses offered
4. Supervision of the student teacher
5. Granting of teacher credentials
6. Availability of specialized training for foreign language teaching in the elementary school

## Admission Requirements

Of the 52 respondents to the questionnaire, 44 percent indicated that admission to the credential program is based, at least in part, on screening by the school of education; 23 percent of the respondents said that admission is based on completion of course requirements, plus examinations and/or screening by the foreign language department; and 17 percent stated that admission is based on completion of course requirements only. The questionnaire has been worded to make it possible for a respondent to reply that admission is based on a combination of any two of the three possible answers, so the percent cited should reflect as closely as possible the admission practices at the institutions surveyed.[3]

---

[3]The percent of institutions requiring and the percent of those recommending a given course do not necessarily total 100 percent, because no course is necessarily required or recommended by all of the institutions. Throughout this report the total of the percents given for any particular item do not necessarily equal 100 percent. Not all respondents answered every item, and, in cases where an item was subdivided, respondents sometimes checked more than one response.

## Programs for Prospective Teachers

The second section of Form A deals with the nature of the training program offered to prospective teachers. The respondent was asked whether the program specifically requires or recommends courses in advanced composition, culture and civilization, phonetics, applied linguistics, history of the language, and contrastive studies (i.e., English as compared to a foreign language). Responses to this question are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Required and Recommended Courses in Programs for Prospective Teachers

| Course | Percent of responses | |
|---|---|---|
| | Required | Recommended |
| Advanced composition | 73 | 10 |
| Culture and civilization | 59 | 24 |
| Phonetics | 55 | 27 |
| Applied linguistics | 50 | 24 |
| History of the language | 24 | 31 |
| Contrastive studies | 21 | 36 |

Thus, according to the answers given with respect to programs for prospective teachers, almost three-fourths of the institutions require advanced composition; the majority also require culture and civilization, phonetics, and applied linguistics. Less than one-fourth require history of the language and contrastive studies. This information is especially significant in relation to teacher attitudes to coursework, which are analyzed in the second part of this survey report.

Fifty-two percent of the respondents indicated that all the courses offered by the foreign language department are taught in the target language, while 31 percent replied that only part of them are. One respondent noted that the only course not taught in the target language is linguistics.

## Methods Course

When asked if the methods course is taught by someone trained in a foreign language, 86 percent of the respondents answered "yes," and 3 percent answered "no." The degree and nature of the training of the 86 percent who were described as "trained" methods teachers was not ascertained.

The questionnaire asked if the methods course is relevant to all foreign languages or if it deals with a specific foreign language. To

this question, 52 percent of the respondents replied that the course is applicable to all foreign languages, and 36 percent said that it deals with a specific foreign language. Of the latter group, approximately one-fourth indicated that the course is taught in the foreign language, while 17 percent said that it is not. The teachers' responses to Form B of the survey did not decry this practice nor did they suggest that methods courses dealing with a specific language should be taught in that language. The possible value of such work is apparently not of concern to either the schools or the teachers. The methods course is a prerequisite for student teaching according to 81 percent of the respondents, but it is not according to 12 percent of them. Areas included in the methods course are shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Major Concern of the Methods Course
in Teacher Training Programs

| Aspects of teacher education included in methods course | Percent of responses | |
|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No |
| Principles of language learning | 90 | 0 |
| Preparation of lesson plans | 86 | 3 |
| Laboratory materials and techniques | 84 | 3 |
| Evaluation of textbooks | 81 | 8 |
| Information about professional organizations and journals | 80 | 3 |
| Observation of actual teaching | 75 | 15 |

Comments were made by two of the respondents in relation to the methods course. One respondent said that a separate course is provided in laboratory materials and techniques at his school. Another person answered that the methods course is still in the formative stage in his institution, but that even when it is underway, it is doubtful that the course will include evaluation of textbooks or information about professional organizations and journals.

There was another question regarding aspects of foreign language study in which practice or evaluation is required of student teachers in their methods courses. Ninety percent of the responses to this question specified reading as required, and 89 percent specified writing. Pronunciation, pattern drills, and dialogue were each specified in 79 percent of the responses, and 40 percent specified culture.

Apparently, the majority of the institutions feel that culture is acquired by the student through studying the language. Major emphasis is still placed on the skills of reading and writing.

## Supervision

The survey revealed that a variety of practices are used in the supervision of student teachers. In answer to the question, "Are student teachers supervised by a regular member of the foreign language staff?" 84 percent of the respondents said "yes," and 36 percent said "no." These figures add up to more than 100 because more than one supervisor may be involved with the student teachers; i.e., there may be supervisors from both the education and the foreign language departments.

Refinement of the above question revealed that of the 84 percent of the supervisors who are regular members of the foreign language staff, only 7 percent are not considered by the respondents to be informed about secondary school education. Of the 36 percent who are not regular members of the foreign language staff, 79 percent are considered proficient in a foreign language. In this instance the questionnaire does not list criteria to be used in determining whether a person is "informed about" secondary school education, nor does it describe what determines the point at which a supervisor would be considered "proficient" or "not proficient" in a foreign language. The decisions made in rating the supervisors in question are therefore subjective.

Fifty-six percent of the respondents replied that both the methods and the supervision of the student teachers are under the direction of the same professor, while 27 percent indicated that more than one professor carries out these closely related functions.

To the question, "How often does the supervisor visit the student teacher?" the replies were as follows:

| Frequency of visits from supervisor | Percent of respondents |
|---|---|
| Once a week or more | 22 |
| Once every two weeks | 40 |
| Once a month | 12 |

Apparently, 26 percent of the schools either do not have supervisors who visit the student teachers, or their representatives did not respond to this question.

A full period is spent in observation by 79 percent of the supervisors, while 12 percent spent only part of a period in that activity. Respondents added that discussion takes place concurrently with student teacher and master teacher in 74 percent of the instances but not in 6 percent.

According to the survey the student teacher is placed in his student teaching position by a department other than the foreign language department in 72 percent of the cases. The foreign language department places the student teacher in 15 percent of the instances.

Since there are sometimes differences in the educational philosophies of master teachers, as with the teacher in the public school under whom the student teacher works as opposed to the college supervisor, respondents were asked who selects the master teachers. The results showed that selection of the master teachers is made by the education department in 54 percent of the instances, by the foreign language department in 30 percent of the cases, and by the public school administration in 23 percent of the cases.[4] Forty-four percent of the respondents noted their institutions do not have a list of approved master teachers, but 40 percent said that they do. This seems to reveal a lack of communication between the public schools and the training institutions.

The period of student teaching varies from one quarter or semester in the case of 36 percent of the respondents to two quarters for 27 percent and one year for 19 percent.

The teaching load of the student teacher was almost evenly divided between one class a day for 44 percent and two or more classes a day for 46 percent of the respondents.

### Granting of Teaching Credential

The granting of the teaching credential is determined solely on the basis of fulfillment of state requirements by 67 percent of the respondents, while 17 percent replied that in addition to the state requirements, the prospective teacher's proficiency in the language is ascertained through standardized tests such as those prepared by the Modern Language Association or the Educational Testing Service.

### Foreign Language in the Elementary School (FLES)

Respondents were asked to indicate whether their institutions have a program for the training of foreign language teachers for the elementary schools. The question may be somewhat vague since it does not indicate whether the response should be in terms of a program exclusively geared to the training of foreign language teachers for the elementary schools. Because of this vagueness, it is

[4]The 7 percent in excess of 100 percent in the sum of these figures represents those institutions that use a combination of two or all three of the methods listed for selecting master teachers.

possible that some of the "yes" answers from 27 percent of the respondents may have included programs in which one or more sessions on FLES were included in a general foreign language methods course. An overwhelming 63 percent of the respondents replied that their institutions have no program for the training of FLES teachers.

# The Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers

The Liaison Committee on Foreign Language received 934 responses to its "Questionnaire on the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers." (See Appendix C.) With few exceptions, those responding were active teachers in daily contact with the classroom. They represent a significant sample of opinion from every region of the state. (For geographical distribution of respondents, see Appendix D.) No attempt was made to identify the institutions or organizations involved in the preparation and training of those answering the questionnaire. Responses, then, reflect neither praise nor criticism of any particular institution, nor indeed of California institutions in general, since many of the teachers originally came from other areas of the country. The sample indicates only how classroom teachers feel about their professional preparation and the training they receive after having obtained their credentials.

Questions 1, 2, 3, and 4 deal with professional preparation for the credential. (See Appendix C.) Summaries of the responses to each of these questions follow.

Question 1: Two tendencies are noted in the responses concerning courses other than those listed which were taken prior to obtaining a credential. Teachers indicated that courses that aimed at improving their linguistic proficiency (e.g., phonetics, advanced conversation, study abroad, and so forth) were of tremendous help. They also stressed the value of professional courses of a practical nature with immediate applicability.

Question 2: Replies to question 2 closely parallel those to question 1. Many respondents mentioned practical methods, conversation courses, linguistics, and civilization courses as those that should have been offered in preparation for the credential. They also asked for grammar, history, literature, and audiovisual laboratory courses. The recommendation in response to this question that audiovisual courses be offered seems to contradict the low rating such courses received in the responses to question 1. However, the feeling that many teachers have that their audiovisual course experience was not closely integrated with their methods course may account for this discrepancy.

Literature also appears on the list of desired courses despite the low rating it received in the responses to question 1. Many respondents complained that their foreign literature courses had not been taught in the original language.

Teachers stress the need for more practice teaching, for more practical classroom experience, for more observation of experienced teachers, for instruction in the audiolingual approach to language teaching, and for help with nonacademic instructional techniques (e.g., songs, games, drama, and so forth), as well as instruction in foreign language testing techniques.

Foreign language for grades one through six was also listed among desired course offerings. This is particularly significant in view of the responses received on the institution questionnaire, which indicated that 63 percent of the institutions surveyed have no program for foreign language in the elementary schools.

The teachers questioned feel they need work in learning theory, in evaluation and analysis of textbooks, and in bilingual education.

Question 3: The responses to question 3 clearly indicate that teachers feel that direct contact in native or quasinative environments with the language they are studying has been most helpful in preparing them to meet the needs of their students. Nearly half the respondents mentioned residence in a foreign country as particularly significant in their preparation. This was followed in importance by foreign travel. Attendance at foreign universities and at government-sponsored language institutes were both rated highly by the teachers as contributing to their preparation, as were language house residence and participation in language club activities. Many other activities were cited as valuable, such as the opportunity for extensive conversation with native speakers. All the activities mentioned concerned close contact with the chosen language and culture.

Question 4: The results of this questionnaire showed that 4.47 percent of the respondents feel that the major department does not place sufficient emphasis on their training as teachers, while 39 percent were satisfied in this respect. This is particularly significant because all the respondents indicated they had been either majors or minors in the language they were teaching.

Teacher replies to questions 1, 2, 3, and 4 suggest areas that should be examined by teacher training institutions. The Liaison Committee on Foreign Language therefore makes the following recommendations:

1. Teachers should be given greater opportunity to observe experienced teachers. This might include more visits to schools,

observation of demonstration classes, and demonstrations by experienced teachers in methods classes.

2. Greater rapport between the foreign language department and the school of education of each institution should be encouraged in relation to teacher training programs and especially in regard to the selection of master teachers and supervisors.
3. Institutions should place greater emphasis on certain courses, such as methods, grammar, phonetics, civilization, linguistics, and composition, all of which the teachers in the survey mentioned as being of vital importance.
4. Foreign literature courses for prospective teachers should be taught in the original language of the literature being studied.
5. Institutions should review their literature programs to ensure the availability of offerings that are relevant and useful for teachers.
6. Instruction in the use of audiovisual materials and language laboratory techniques and media should be incorporated into the training program for language teachers.

Questions 5, 6, 7, and 8 deal with post-credential coursework and inservice programs. Summaries of the responses to each of these questions follow.

Question 5: Although literature is shown in Table 3 as one of the least helpful courses that teachers take after they have obtained their credentials, it was by far the course most frequently mentioned in response to question 5. Other courses mentioned frequently were conversation, advanced grammar, culture, a second foreign language,

Table 3

Ratings of Courses and Activities Taken by Credential Holders

| Course or activity | Percent of responses | |
|---|---|---|
| | Most helpful | Least helpful |
| Observation of experienced teacher | 79 | 8 |
| Practice teaching | 69 | 8 |
| Methods | 66 | 20 |
| Advanced grammar | 61 | 15 |
| Phonetics | 60 | 12 |
| Civilization | 52 | 18 |
| Linguistics | 51 | 21 |
| Advanced composition | 50 | 26 |
| Literature | 39 | 38 |
| Audiovisual and laboratory training | 37 | 34 |

phonology, and applied linguistics. There is a close correlation between the courses cited as most helpful in the first section of the questionnaire and those most frequently taken since obtaining the credential. Among the courses listed by the respondents as helpful were also many that were not related to language teaching.

The wide variety of courses taken suggests that teachers are interested in many kinds of courses that will improve their competence as teachers. The fact that many courses not related to language and language teaching were taken raises a question as to the availability of courses immediately related to foreign language study.

Question 6: In regard to inservice programs as opposed to formal courses, teachers listed as most helpful methods workshops, workshops offered by publishing companies or by school districts in the use of particular textbooks, training sessions in the preparation of tapes and other audiovisual materials, and training in the use of nonacademic instructional techniques (e.g., games, songs, and so forth.). Other experiences listed as particularly valuable included class observation, attendance at language association meetings, and workshops in English as a second language.

Question 7: Teachers were extremely critical of many inservice programs, singling out those led by personnel described as "weak" in the foreign language area and those in which the methodology presented personnel described as "weak" in the foreign language area and those where the methodology presented was "outdated, geared too low, or unrealistic for the teacher who has to use it six periods per day." It may be noted that 42 percent of the respondents did not say which inservice programs had proved least helpful, 20 percent replied that none of the inservice programs in which they had participated had been of any use, and 2.3 percent felt that all of the inservice training they had received had been helpful although they did not indicate in what way or to what extent.

Question 8: Approximately 75 percent of the respondents made specific suggestions concerning desired inservice training programs. Teachers emphasized over and over that these inservice programs should be available to them during released time. Table 4 reflects the desires of teachers for inservice programs. Although the percent of respondents may seem low for some of the items, such detailed responses to this question were unsolicited and thus reflect a particular concern on the part of the teachers.

There is frequently a similarity between the courses teachers list as desirable for inservice training purposes and those they mention as valuable at the precredential level. In their responses to questions

about inservice training, for example, teachers again stressed the desirability of close contact with the language and culture through foreign residence and participation in federally sponsored language institutes. They further suggested that sabbatical leaves and scholarships be made available to teachers at all levels so that they may live and study in foreign countries. Other courses not exclusively applicable to foreign language teaching were suggested fairly frequently. These included courses in supervision tailored to specific classroom conditions, team teaching techniques, the use of modular scheduling, and techniques of instructional television. The teachers also suggested training in the use of programmed materials for foreign language instruction and the development of teaching films made by experts for experts.

Table 4

Inservice Programs Desired by Teachers

| Program | Percent of responses |
|---|---|
| Methods courses, taught by experts, that are realistic, innovative, and effective in demonstrating the teaching of all of the skills at all levels and which correlate the use of audiovisual aids | 20.7 |
| Training in how to motivate students who (a) are required to take a foreign language but who do not really want to do so; and (b) are all in the same class but are working at widely varying levels | 4 |
| "How to" courses in linguistics, advanced grammar, and composition | 3.6 |
| Discussion groups involving teachers and experts | 3.3 |
| Workshops in which audiovisual teachers can improve their techniques in the use of audiovisual materials and labs (Several persons suggested that such workshops be followed up with related workshops in which the teachers could prepare the same or similar materials for use in the classroom.) | 2.7 |
| District inservice training designed to provide full articulation of the foreign language program | 2.4 |
| Practical workshops (The recent State Department of Education Practical Training Workshops in Foreign Language were specifically mentioned.) | 2.1 |
| Workshops to demonstrate specific texts and their strengths and weaknesses | 2.1 |

The following recommendations are based on remarks and suggestions by teachers regarding inservice training programs:

1. Inservice training programs should be of a practical nature and should deal with the kinds of problems faced daily by teachers in the classroom.
2. A regular and continuing program of training in ever-changing methodology involving new and developing techniques and materials should be the goal of those involved in training and supervising foreign language teachers.
3. Inservice training programs should be conducted by experts in the field.
4. Every possible effort should be made to provide released time for teachers to participate in inservice training programs.
5. Teachers at all levels should be given sabbatical leaves, and financial aid to enable them to live and study abroad should be available.

# Summary

Using replies received to the survey questionnaire, the Liaison Committee on Foreign Language has tried to formulate the wishes of teachers who are confronted daily with the problems of the classroom. The Committee's recommendations should therefore be of interest to everyone who deals with the preparation of language teachers. The Liaison Committee is most grateful to everyone who has helped in collecting and making this information available, especially to persons at teacher training institutions and to the hundreds of teachers who spent their valuable time providing thoughtful answers.

Teachers call upon the profession generally to provide practical training in all areas. They ask for more contact with the language and with the culture of its speakers. They ask for more opportunity to develop professionally, for more teaching practice, for more time to observe masters in the field, and for concrete suggestions and practical guidance while they are preparing to teach and, later, while they are teaching.

The Liaison Committee on Foreign Language undertook this survey in the belief that it will prove to be of great value to the profession. The Committee believes that implementation of the teachers' suggestions by teacher training institutions and school districts planning workshops for foreign language teachers will definitely improve the foreign language instruction provided in California's schools.

# Appendix A

## A Survey of Teacher Training in Foreign Languages

**(FORM A)**

A. Admission to credential program requires:

_____ Completion of course requirements only

_____ Requirements plus examinations and/or screening by the foreign language department

_____ Screening by the school of education

B. Program for prospective teachers

| 1. Courses | Required | Recommended |
|---|---|---|
| a. Phonetics | _____ | _____ |
| b. Applied linguistics | _____ | _____ |
| c. Culture and civilization | _____ | _____ |
| d. Contrastive studies (English vs. foreign language) | _____ | _____ |
| e. Advanced composition | _____ | _____ |
| f. History of the language | _____ | _____ |

2. Are courses offered by your foreign language department taught in the target language?

_____ All? _____ Part?

C. Methods courses

1. Is your course in methods taught by someone trained in a foreign language?

_____ Yes _____ No

2. Is your course a methods course for all foreign languages or does it deal with a specific foreign language?

_____ All _____ Specific

3. If your methods course is a specific foreign language, is it taught in that foreign language?

_____ Yes _____ No

4. Is your methods course a prerequisite for student teaching?

_____ Yes _____ No

5. Does your methods course include

a. Observation of actual teaching?

_____ Yes _____ No

b. Laboratory materials and techniques?

_____ Yes _____ No

c. Evaluation of textbooks?

_____ Yes _____ No

d. Principles of language learning?

_____ Yes _____ No

e. Information about professional organizations and journals?

_____ Yes _____ No

f. Preparation of lesson plans?

_____ Yes _____ No

g. Student practice in and evaluation of:
(Check those which apply.)

_____ Pattern drills

_____ Dialogues

_____ Reading

_____ Writing

_____ Pronunciation

_____ Culture

D. Supervision

1. Are student teachers supervised by a regular member of the foreign language staff?

_____ Yes _____ No

If *yes*, is that person informed about secondary school education?

_____ Yes _____ No

If *no*, is that person proficient in a foreign language?

_____ Yes _____ No

2. Are both methods and supervision under the direction of the same teacher?

_____ Yes _____ No

3. How often does the supervisor visit the student teacher?

_____ Once a week or more

_____ Once every two weeks

_____ Once a month

4. What is the average period of time spent in observation?

_____ Part of a period

_____ Full period

5. Does discussion take place concurrently with student teacher and master teacher?

_____ Yes _____ No

6. Does your foreign language department place the student teacher?

_____ Yes _____ No

7. Are master teachers selected by

_____ Education department?

_____ Foreign language department?

_____ Public school administrators?

8. Do you have a list of approved master teachers?

_____ Yes _____ No

9. What is the period of student teaching?

_____ One quarter or semester

_____ Two quarters

_____ One year

10. What is the teaching load of the student teacher?

_____ One class a day

_____ Two or more

E. Granting of Teacher Credential

1. Is the granting of teacher credential determined

_____ By fulfillment of state requirements only?

_____ By requirements plus proficiency revealed through standardized tests (MLA, ETS, and so forth)?

F. Do you have a program for the training of foreign language teachers for the elementary schools?

_____ Yes _____ No

# Appendix B

## Universities, State Colleges, and Private Schools from Which Responses to Form A Were Received

| | Number of survey forms completed and returned |
|---|---|
| **I. Private Schools** | |
| College of Notre Dame | 2 |
| Immaculate Heart College | |
| Department of French | 1 |
| Pomona College | 1 |
| Stanford University | |
| Departments of German, French, and Education | 3 |
| University of the Pacific | |
| Departments of Modern Language and Education (combined) | 1 |
| University of Southern California | 1 |
| Total from six private schools | 9 |
| **II. State Colleges** | |
| California State College, Dominguez Hills | |
| Foreign Language Department | 1 |
| California State College, Hayward | |
| Departments of Spanish and French | 2 |
| California State College, San Bernardino | 1 |
| Fresno State College | |
| Foreign Language Department | 1 |
| Fullerton State College | |
| Department of Foreign Language and Literature | 1 |
| Humboldt State College | |
| Departments of German, French, and Spanish | 3 |
| Long Beach State College | |
| Department of Foreign Languages | 1 |
| Los Angeles State College | |
| Departments of Spanish and German | 2 |

| | Number of survey forms completed and returned |
|---|---|
| **II. State Colleges (continued)** | |
| Sacramento State College | |
| Spanish Area and Department of Foreign Languages | 2 |
| San Diego State College | |
| Departments of French and Italian | 2 |
| San Fernando Valley State College | |
| Department of Foreign Languages | 1 |
| San Jose State College | 1 |
| Sonoma State College | |
| Division of Humanities | 1 |
| Stanislaus State College | 1 |
| Total from 14 state colleges | 20 |
| **III. University of California** | |
| Berkeley | 4 |
| Departments of Spanish and Portuguese, Education, German, and French | |
| Davis | 4 |
| Departments of Education, German, Spanish, and French and Italian | |
| Irvine | 5 |
| Departments of Education, French, Spanish, German, and one unclassified department | |
| Los Angeles | 4 |
| Departments of Education, Germanic Languages, Spanish and Portuguese, and French | |
| Riverside | 3 |
| Departments of French and Italian, Education, and German and Russian | |
| Santa Barbara | 3 |
| Departments of German, Italian and French, and Spanish | |
| Total from six University of California Campuses | 23 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Private schools | 6 |
| State colleges | 14 |
| University of California | 6 |
| Total number of schools responding | 26 |
| Total number of survey forms returned | 52 |

# Appendix C

## Questionnaire on the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers

**(FORM B)**

1. Of the following items (courses and activities taken in preparation for the credential) check those which have proved to be most helpful and least helpful to you as a foreign language teacher.

| | Most helpful | Least helpful |
|---|---|---|
| Methods | | |
| Literature | | |
| Phonetics | | |
| Linguistics | | |
| Civilization | | |
| Advanced composition | | |
| Advanced grammar | | |
| Observation of experienced teachers | | |
| Practice teaching | | |
| Audiovisual and laboratory training | | |
| Others (Please list by name of course.) | | |

2. List by title courses which you feel should have been offered.

_____

_____

_____

3. List additional experiences which proved helpful (language house, language clubs, residence in a foreign country, settlement work, economic opportunity work, and so forth).

_____

_____

_____

4. Did your major department place sufficient emphasis upon preparing you as a foreign language teacher?

_____

5. List additional courses taken since obtaining the credential.

_____

_____

_____

6. Which inservice programs have you participated in that have proved most helpful to you as a foreign language teacher?

_____

_____

_____

7. Which inservice programs have you participated in that have proved least helpful?

_____

_____

_____

8. What kinds of inservice programs would you like to see offered?

_____

_____

_____

9. This questionnaire was filled out by: (circle one)

Supervisor Coordinator School administrator Department head Teacher

10. Please circle the grade level at which you are presently teaching:

Elementary Junior high school Senior high school Other

11. Please state the county in which you are presently employed.

_____

12. Do you have a major or a minor (specify which one) in a foreign language?

_____ Major _____ Minor

Please send completed questionnaire to Foreign Language Programs, State Department of Education, 721 Capitol Mall, Room 630, Sacramento, CA 95814. Please return completed questionnaire before October 20, 1968.

# Appendix D

## Location by County of Respondents to Survey Form B

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Alameda | 49 (includes one private school) |
| 2. | Fresno | 20 |
| 3. | Imperial | 6 |
| 4. | Kern | 23 |
| 5. | Lassen | 6 |
| 6. | Los Angeles | 276 |
| 7. | Madera | 2 |
| 8. | Merced | 13 |
| 9. | Monterey | 31 |
| 10. | Orange | 24 |
| 11. | Sacramento | 127 |
| 12. | San Bernardino | 26 |
| 13. | San Diego | 125 |
| 14. | San Francisco | 86 |
| 15. | San Joaquin | 40 |
| 16. | San Luis Obispo | 12 |
| 17. | Santa Barbara | 12 |
| 18. | Santa Clara | 29 |
| 19. | Siskiyou | 4 |
| 20. | Solano | 5 |
| 21. | Sonoma | 1 |
| 22. | Stanislaus | 16 |
| 23. | Yolo | 1 |
| | Total | 934 |

# Appendix E

## Members of the Liaison Committee on Foreign Language 1969–70*

### High School Representatives

Richard W. Cordano, Principal, Arcadia High School, Arcadia
Bill James, Principal, Royal High School, Simi
Charles R. Lewin, Assistant Superintendent of Educational Services, San Luis Coastal Unified School District
Norman Loats, Associate Superintendent, Newport-Mesa Unified School District
Robert Schilling, Assistant Superintendent, La Puente Union High School District
Harold Wingard, Specialist, Foreign Language, San Diego City Unified School District

### Junior College Representatives

Roger C. Anton, Head, Department of Foreign Languages, San Bernardino Valley College, San Bernardino
Ruth P. Craig, Chairman, Department of Foreign Languages, Santa Rosa Junior College, Santa Rosa
Charles W. Lovy, Chairman, Department of Foreign Languages, Contra Costa College, San Pablo
Blas Mercurio, Chairman, Foreign Language Department, Citrus College, Azusa
J. Michael Moore, German and French Instructor, San Diego Mesa College, San Diego
George M. Washington, Chairman, Foreign Language Department, Grossmont College, El Cajon

### State College Representatives

Alfred F. Alberico, Associate Professor of Foreign Language; and Chairman, San Francisco State College
William O. Cord, Associate Professor of Spanish, Sonoma State College

---

*The titles and locations given for persons mentioned here are those that were in effect when this report was written.

Winston R. Hewitt, Associate Professor of French, California State College at Dominguez Hills
Richard H. Lawson, Professor of German, San Diego State College
Porfirio Sanchez, Assistant Professor of Foreign Language, California State College at Los Angeles

### University of California Representatives

Thomas L. Broadbent, Professor of German, Riverside
Claude L. Hulet, Associate Professor of Spanish, Los Angeles
George H. Keith, Assistant Professor of French, Davis
Donald R. Larson, Department of Spanish and Portuguese, Berkeley
Edmund E. Masson, Department of Italian and French, Santa Barbara
Julian Palley, Associate Professor of Humanities, Irvine
Vern W. Robinson, Associate Professor of German and Director of Relations with Schools, Los Angeles (ex officio member)

### State Department of Education Representative

Mrs. Julia Gonsalves, Consultant in Foreign Languages, Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education

### California Community Colleges Representative

Kenneth A. Wood, Consultant in Pupil Personnel Services, Office of the Chancellor, The California Community Colleges

# Appendix F

## Former Members of the Liaison Committee*

Howard A. Appel, Supervisor of Teacher Education, Department of Foreign Languages, University of California at Irvine
Arthur L. Askins, Assistant Professor of Spanish, University of California at Berkeley
Joseph Axelrod, Associate Dean for Academic Planning, San Francisco State College
Clifford H. Baker, Professor of Spanish, San Diego State College
James H. Baltzell, Associate Professor, Foreign Languages, California State College at Long Beach
Genevieve Delattre, Associate Professor of Education, Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, University of California at Santa Barbara
John Dusel, Consultant in Foreign Languages, California State Department of Education
Tom Giugni, Assistant Superintendent, Lompoc Unified School District
Frank Gulick, Assistant Superintendent of Instruction, Ventura Union High School District
George V. Hall, Associate Superintendent, San Diego Unified School District
Jesse Hiraoka, Professor of French, California State College at San Bernardino
Keith W. Jacob, Principal, Mills Junior High School
Robert Jimenez, Assistant Principal, Hillcrest School
Leonard D. Newmark, Chairman, Department of Linguistics, University of California at San Diego
Merle L. Perkins, Chairman, Department of French and Italian, University of California at Davis
Robert E. Pyle, Head, Department of Foreign Languages, Chico State College
Pauline B. Rice, Chairman, Division of Humanities, Imperial Valley College
G. Gilbert Rogers, Secondary Curriculum Consultant, Office of the San Luis Obispo County Superintendent of Schools
O. Carl Schulz, Instructor of German, Santa Ana College
Alex Turkatte, Department of Foreign Languages, San Joaquin Delta College
John K. Wells, President, East Los Angeles College, Los Angeles

*The titles and locations given for persons mentioned here are those that were in effect when this report was written.